

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner noted that claims 1-42 are pending in the application and that claims 1-8, 23 and 24 are rejected. However, in the body of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 14, 16-36, 38 and 42. There appears to be an error in the Office Action Summary and Applicants will follow the rejection that is detailed in the body of the Office Action. By this response, claims 14 and 36 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-42 are pending in the application.

Allowed and Allowable Claims

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 9-13. Furthermore, the Examiner has indicated that claims 15, 37, and 39-41 would be allowable if they are amended to incorporate respective rejected base claims and any intervening claims. However, amendment to independent claims 14 and 36 has instead been undertaken in response to an interview with the Examiner.

Examiner Interview

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for a telephone interview on May 25, 2007 where details of rejected independent claims 14 and 36 were discussed. Applicant Sankar Jayaram also participated in this telephone interview. No agreement was reached, but the inclusion of limitations directed to specific parameters used to correct discrepancies

for feature-based and parametric geometric models was discussed. These limitations are reflected in the amended language of independent claims 14 and 36.

Double Patenting

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 18-35 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 and 23-34 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/999,096.

In response to the Examiner's rejection, a Terminal Disclaimer is being submitted with this response in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) which is being used herein to overcome an obviousness-type double patenting grounds for rejection. The conflicting U.S. Patent Application No. 09/999,096 is shown to be commonly owned with the present application via the Terminal Disclaimer. Accordingly, the double patenting rejection of claims 1-8 and 18-35 is believed to be overcome, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C., §103

Claims 14, 16, 17, 36, 38 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Etzion* (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,835), in view of *Moseley* (Moseley, Lonnie E.; Boodey, David M.; "Mastering Microsoft Office 97", 1997, second edition, Sybex). Independent claims 14 and 36 have been amended to include the limitation, "...by selectively substituting from one of: 1) a group of all possible combinations of features,

Application Serial No. 10/781,497
Amendment dated 6/1/2007
in Response to Office Action dated 12/01/2006

dimensions, sketches, parameters and definitions supported by the target CAD system,
and 2) a group of all variations of features, dimensions, sketches, parameters and
definitions supported by the target CAD system in an effort to resolve the discrepancy”.

Accordingly, this limitation, in combination with the associated claim language, is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art references and the claims are believed to be allowable (along with rejected dependent claims 16-17 and 38, 42).

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview before issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/1/07

By: 

Keith D. Grzelak
Reg. No. 37,144